

October 12, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 8979

But when young people, in categorical and dogmatic terms, reject all society, and reject it with bitterness and disdain, questions should be asked. What is their purpose? What is their vision? What is wrong?

For a better society, conceived on Judaic-Christian realities, cannot be brought about by New Leftism. The New Leftists claim a high moral purpose ("Basically SDS politics stem from disaffection and a moral outrage . . .") and a spiritual sensitivity to injustice, intolerance, and unfairness. But how can this be?

When you sweepingly denounce the responsible leadership of the nation, even those who are honestly and sincerely trying to correct the many ills of our society (legitimate reform leaders are regularly lampooned by the New Left), who remains?

When you bitterly distrust the older generation and accuse it of the most base mendacity and dishonesty (usually without proof or facts), where is fairness?

When you find incidents of hypocrisy and sham in our society (there are some), and then indict all of society, overlooking what is good and positive, isn't this having a distorted vision?

When you speak (as does the New Left) in terms of a dogmatic moralism that considers itself right and all other viewpoints wrong, where are the possibilities of creative dialogue?

When you denounce and denounce and denounce and offer nothing constructive, what happens?

When you constantly view your country as being in the wrong but saying nothing really critical about Communism, or Castro, or Mao, or Ho, isn't this indicative of a preconceived bias?

No concrete proof exists that the New Left is sincerely interested (as it claims) in improving this country. That's why it is at heart a form of neo-paganism.

The whole mood of the New Left makes the movement particularly susceptible to infiltration and manipulation by the so-called "Old Left"—meaning the Communist Party and the Trotskyites. And that is exactly what is happening. The Communist Party, for example, and its youth front, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, have deeply imbedded themselves in the New Left—helping organize demonstrations, participating in planning sessions, making policy decisions.

Not that the entire New Left is Communist-dominated. It is not. Some elements of the New Left have criticized the Communist Party. This criticism, however, is not so much opposition to Marxist-Leninist principles as opposition to Communist concepts of discipline and organization. Though sympathetic to Communist aims, they do not want to become Communist members and be caught up in the Party's bureaucracy.

As part of its youth program, the Party is today making strenuous efforts to reap benefit from the New Left. In a recent discussion of the New Left in the Party's theoretical journal, *Political Affairs*, a writer made these frank comments in an article entitled "Many Can Be Won for Communism:"

"I believe it is time for the Party to consider the New Left as a recruiting ground for militant cadre. . . . Proctor [one of the other writers] is correct in stating that there is a surprisingly large section of the New Left ready to listen to Communists, and willing to see Communist ideas in action. I hasten to add, and to join the Communist Party, if and when the opportunity presents itself. Let us prepare classes, develop open youth leadership, establish social contact with individuals of the New Left, and, in short, bring those whom we can into our ranks. In doing so we will go a long way towards preparing our Party for the new radical period ahead."

Here is the danger—that a disciplined, experienced revolutionary organization, like the Communist Party, will be able to reach into

the variegated, at times almost chaotic, New Left movement, recruit young people, and then train them into revolutionary cadres. Remembering the words of Lenin, the Party realizes that revolutionary zeal, vociferous and outspoken, is not of great value unless it is channeled into revolutionary cadres—the dedicated men and women who are trained for revolution. The tumultuous unpredictability of some of the New Left leaders makes the Party distrustful of them; but the New Left as a movement has given the Party an ideological bonanza undreamed of just a few years ago.

In the book of Isaiah (5: 4) a verse which often comes to my mind:

"What more was there to do for my vineyard, that I have not done in it?
When I looked for it to yield grapes, why did it yield wild grapes?"

Why the New Left? What has caused this nihilist group—small in numbers yet potentially great for evil? Why have these wild grapes grown in a society which has lavished so much time, attention, and wealth on its young people, to train them to be responsible citizens?

"We come from homes with all the status tickets," a New Left student told a newsmen. "We were born into comfort and security. Our disaffection comes from having all that society has to offer—and feeling shallow. Other kids have the American dream before them. We were born into the American dream."

Maybe society has lavished too much of the wrong kind of things on these young people? Too much money for personal use? Too much permissiveness? Too much affluence? A high percentage of college-age New Leftists come from affluent homes—where they have never wanted in the physical things of life. Have too many parents placed a false emphasis in the lives of these young people, stressing the material rather than the spiritual? Have young people been taught to prize what is expedient and easy rather than to work hard and do an acceptable job?

Maybe we have emphasized too much the rights and privileges of the individual rather than his duties and responsibilities?

Just what are the churches doing? Are clergymen and concerned laymen devoting the attention they should to youth? Are they involved in a dialogue—a heart-to-heart conversation—with these young people, endeavoring to answer some of their probing questions about human existence, such as: Who am I? Why am I here? What is the purpose of life? What values have meaning?

All of us, clergymen and laymen, need to look deeper into our hearts to answer these questions.

1. We need to know our young people better. Young people want a helping hand, love, care, and nurture. There are too many broken homes, separated families, and failures of the parent-youth relationship. Too many parents don't know their children today.

2. We must realize that monetary affluence (money, home, swimming pool) cannot by themselves capture a child's affection. Money is too often used to bribe children—to keep them falsely happy, to simulate a parent-child relationship that doesn't exist. The irresponsible flabbiness of affluence has become a deterrent to spiritual growth.

3. We need to inculcate in our young people the idea that in a free society the single person counts. Too many of these young people complain of powerlessness, impotence, spiritual sterility. Their vision is distorted. They can, by exercising intelligence, moral example, and initiative, influence the world in which they live. Our society is not, except to the perennial pessimist, a closed, fixed society that defies efforts to change it.

4. We must emphasize that the generations must work together. Trust runs from child

to parent and parent to child. Civilization is created by the constant interaction of generations. In a society growing increasingly young, there must be a new respect for the wisdom of the elders.

5. We need to instill a love of country in the hearts of young Americans—that they are heirs of a great tradition of liberty and that if it is to remain meaningful it must be won anew each day. Patriotism is not old-fashioned. Being proud of country and flag is the natural response of concerned and intelligent citizens.

6. We need to encourage our young generation to understand fully that obedience to law is the heart of democratic society. If a person disobeys a law just because he doesn't like it, or feels it is wrong, this can only bring chaos. Our free society contains constitutional processes whereby laws can be changed. Unilateral disobedience is wrong.

7. Young people must realize that spiritual faith is the ultimate lifeline of fruitful living. God is the eternal hope. Man-made gods, like chips of wood, perish. They hold temporary thrall, but disintegrate in the burning sun of human experience. To live fully, abundantly, and courageously, man needs God.

In the history of the world no figure has reinforced the true and the good more than Jesus of Nazareth, and no book has wielded greater power for goodness and decency than the Bible. To know the Judaic-Christian realities afresh is the great consuming need of the younger generation today, and there is little hope of their renewal unless adults make these commitments their own. Never have the churches—clergy and laity—lived in a time of greater opportunity to exhibit the importance of faith and trust in God and of obedience to his will, and never in the history of our generation would their failure to do so be more calamitous.

CZECH INVASION PREDICTED, ROMANIAN INVASION WARNED BY HUNGARIAN FREEDOM GROUP

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues in the House today a statement issued by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters warning against a policy of appeasement by the United States in Eastern Europe.

This resolution warns against the dangers of allowing the strength of NATO to dissolve, of turning a deaf ear to the cries for freedom in Czechoslovakia, and of sowing the seeds of appeasement where Soviet action in Eastern Europe is concerned.

It is a resolution that bears careful reading and contemplation because it points out that the current crisis in Eastern Europe is the result of the Soviet Union's ability to suppress freedom in a nation by military force without fear of reprisal.

I can only pray that the echos of marching feet into the Sudetenland in 1939 are not replaced in 1968 with Russian boots marching across the face of Europe because this Nation forgot the lesson of World War II.

The preface and resolution follow:

PREFACE

The Hungarian Freedom Federation, U.S.A., meeting in its Seventh Congress, comes together at a very auspicious time.

Only a few days after the ruthless Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, we met in an atmosphere of much questioning and even fear about the future of the balance of power between the East and West. As Hungarian Freedom Fighters, we are in a unique position to assess the meaning of the situation in Czechoslovakia.

In a public statement made August 31, 1968, by Representative Frank Horton (R-N.Y.), the American people were advised to "watch closely the proceedings of this Seventh Congress of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation, because the survivors of red tyranny against Hungary in 1956 have much to teach us about the current crisis.

It is in this perspective that we offer the following resolution.

RESOLUTION OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS FEDERATION U.S.A. CONCERNING THE CURRENT CRISIS IN EAST EUROPE

The bridge designed by Western concern in search for betterment of the prevailing conditions in Eastern Europe and built by miscalculation of political realities collapsed under the weight of Russian tanks invading Prague.

Based on our unique personal experience and firsthand knowledge of Soviet tactics we warned the Secretary General of the United Nations as early as July 27th, 1968 in a telegram to be prepared for those eventualities which have since become facts.

In 1956, a spontaneous, popular, armed repudiation of Communism failed in Hungary despite of the gallantry of the Hungarian people and of the unanimous condemnation of the Russian aggression by world opinion.

Just recently and in contrast, a carefully designed and officially controlled effort by the Czechoslovak Communist Party toward liberalization, within the framework of the Warsaw Pact was similarly crushed as soon as it became apparent that a meaningful degree of individual freedom in Czechoslovakia might be achieved.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A. never subscribed to the notion that a one-sided bridge-building policy can ever achieve any beneficial results.

The Seventh National Congress of the Federation presents the following conclusions:

1. Behind the Communist ideological tirades Russian imperialistic aims are hidden and realized by naked Russian aggression.
2. It is evident that the Kremlin's recent foreign policy decisions have been suggested by the military, alarmed by the possibility of losing control over tactically important geographical areas.
3. In view of the Russian generals' growing influence in policymaking, further aggressive moves of the Red Army can be expected in order to secure advantageous positions.
4. The invasion shortly following the Bratislava agreement demonstrates again the utter disregard of moral and international obligations by the Soviet government.
5. In the face of naked Russian aggression any relaxation of Western military alertness and preparedness seems to be suicidal.
6. The brute exhibition of force clearly showed to the Western Communist parties and sympathizers that they can count on the "support" an "brotherly friendship" of the Soviet Union only as long as they are willing to serve the interests of Russian nationalism over and above their own. The implementation of the concept of "humanized Communism" is hopeless under such circumstances.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A. deems the following measures necessary and feasible.

The resolutions made by the NATO ambassadors in Washington, D.C., on August 31st, 1968 and the policy described by the representative of the U.S. Department of State should be immediately and greatly expanded. In details:

A. A decisive, immediate and public repudiation of any secret obligations establishing the status-quo in Eastern Europe is needed if such obligations exist. If such obligations never existed diplomatic timidity shall not honor and perpetuate the de facto established lines of the status-quo.

B. To discourage further military adventures of the Russian Army the urgent re-vigoration of the NATO Alliance and the updating of conventional armament for the armed forces of the Alliance is imperative.

C. Recently established economic policies for better East-West relations must be re-evaluated. As a starting step, a revocation of economic concessions should follow the Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia.

D. Inept and timid diplomatic statements, inviting aggression should be ceased by high level officials in the NATO Alliance. Forceful and unequivocal pronouncements, such as that made by the U.S. President warning against invasion of Rumania, should make it evident that no further aggressions will be tolerated.

The appeasement in 1938 resulted in World War II. An appeasement in 1968 may very well sow the seeds of World War III. History seldom repeats itself: still those who are unable or unwilling to learn from the lessons of the past deserve to be victimized by the repetition of history.

September 1, 1968 at the Seventh Congress of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A.

DR. ANDRAS FOGANY,

President.

BAAN VITEZ,

Vice President, World Federation.

LASZLO PASZTOR,

Secretary General.

ISTVAN GEREBEN,

Vice President.

THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have learned of the resignation of my good friend and coworker on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Congressman THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York. Congressman KUPFERMAN has been a Member of this body for only two terms, but in this short time we have learned to respect and appreciate his hard work and efforts in behalf of this Nation's veterans.

Congressman KUPFERMAN has faithfully devoted his time and energies to the best interest of this Nation. He has loyally served his constituents in the 17th District of New York. Congressman KUPFERMAN possesses those qualities which best describe a devoted and patriotic American.

We will miss Congressman KUPFERMAN here on the floor of the House, as well as in our committee. I extend my best wishes to him in his new undertakings.

THE ARMS RACE: TOO MUCH OF A BAD THING

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States faces a major decision on nuclear policy that will affect the nature of this world for a long time to come.

That question is whether to build new and more sophisticated nuclear weaponry or to negotiate an agreement to limit the proliferation of weapons of strategic warfare. At stake is the security of the world and the lives of millions of people.

Mr. Andrew Hamilton, writing in the New York Times Magazine of October 6, 1968, offers cogent and lucid arguments for working toward the limiting of those weapons as the way to provide security for the peoples of the world.

Mr. Hamilton states so well the futility of the arms race when he says:

The United States and the U.S.S.R. have reached a high plateau of mutual deterrence where strenuous efforts to achieve nuclear "superiority" are self-deluding. Yet in the absence of a mutual agreement to end the strategic arms race, both nations are condemned to continue adding more and new varieties of weapons to their forces, each nervously watching for a "technological breakthrough"—such as a perfect antimissile system—that would give its opponent a decisive advantage.

Given the mutual deterrence, any money which either the United States or the Soviet Union spends in the future on strategic arms, except to insure the survivability and deliverability of its nuclear deterrent, will have only an uncertain symbolic value, and most likely will simply stimulate strategic spending by the other side. The world provides a constant reminder that there are more important uses for its resources than a contest between wealthy nations for nuclear "superiority."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit Mr. Hamilton's article for inclusion in the RECORD. It is essential, in our deliberations on the buildup of "deterrent weapons," that the futility of the arms race and its effect on our security are considered and understood by the Congress. I hope all Members will take the time to read it.

The article follows:

THE ARMS RACE: TOO MUCH OF A BAD THING

(By Andrew Hamilton)

WASHINGTON.—The United States and the Soviet Union, in the autumn of 1963, face major decisions on nuclear policy that will affect the nature of their rivalry for a long time to come. One choice is to explore, in the phrase of former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, their "mutuality of interests" in limiting the weapons of strategic warfare. The other, in the absence of negotiations, is to plunge into a new and possibly more frantic era of nuclear weapons competition.

Over the past seven years each of the two powers has acquired, at great cost, large strategic missile forces capable of destroying the other as an organized society. And each side has also kept a substantial number of long-range nuclear bombers, dating from the fifties, to supplement their missiles. At this point in history, their forces are roughly in balance. Neither side can deprive the other of its deterrent strength. A surprise attack by either would still leave the victim with more